

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT

PRIVATE  
ENDC/PV.44  
29 May 1962  
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 15 1963

DOCUMENT  
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 29 May 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MACOVESCU

(Romania)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS  
Mr. de ALENCAR ARARIPE  
Miss M. GOES

Bulgaria:

Mr. M. TARABANOV  
Mr. N. MINTCHEV  
Mr. G. GUELEV  
Mr. M. KARASSILEONOV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON  
U Tin MAUNG  
U Aye LWIN

Canada:

Mr. E. L. M. BURNS  
Mr. J. E. G. HARDY  
Mr. A. GOTLIEB  
Mr. R. M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. HAJEK  
Mr. M. ZEMLA  
Mr. E. PEPICH  
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. M. HAMID  
Mr. A. MANDEFRO

India:

Mr. A. S. LALL  
Mr. A. S. MEHTA  
Mr. R. K. RAO  
Mr. G. D. COMAR

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. A. CAGIATI  
Mr. F. LUCIOLI OTTIERI  
Mr. C. COSTA-RIGHINI

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO  
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG  
Miss E. AGUIRRE  
Mr. GONZALES GOMEZ

Nigeria:

Mr. A. A. ATTA  
Mr. L. C. N. OBI

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI  
Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN  
Mr. M. BIEN  
Mr. J. SLAWINSKI

Romania:

Mr. G. MACOVESCU  
Mr. M. MALITZA  
Mr. C. SANDRU  
Mr. E. GLASER

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL  
Mr. M. STAHL  
Mr. B. FRIEDMAN  
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V. A. ZORIN  
Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN  
Mr. I. G. USACHEV  
Mr. V. N. ZHEREBTSOV

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A. S. HASSAN  
Mr. A. EL ERIAN  
Mr. G. EL ABO  
Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

United Kingdom:

Mr. J. B. GODBER  
Sir Michael WRIGHT  
Mr. J. S. H. SHATTOCK  
Mr. J. H. LAMBERT

United States of America:

Mr. A. H. DEAN  
Mr. C. C. STELLE  
Mr. V. BAKER  
Mr. R. A. MARTIN

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. G. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative of  
the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): I declare open the forty-fourth meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

The Conference is to discuss this morning the item dealing with the declaration against war propaganda.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I have been instructed by the Soviet Government to make the following statement in connexion with discussion of the question of a declaration against war propaganda:

"Recent events, including those of the last few days, which cannot be ignored, have made it necessary for the Soviet Government to reconsider the question of the provisions that should be included in the Declaration against War Propaganda (ENDC/C.1/20) in order to make this document a useful and effective instrument in the struggle against the aggressive forces which are maturing plans to precipitate a new war. Among these facts are the following.

"On 26 May 1962 the Soviet Government learnt that, on 25 May, when the Committee of the Whole was discussing the draft Declaration against War Propaganda, Mr. Strauss, the West German Minister of Defence, put forward a demand in the NATO publication, Revue militaire generale, that the Bundeswehr should immediately be given atomic weapons for war against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government cannot fail to draw the appropriate inferences from this preposterous statement, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Strauss is not a private individual but is one of the leading figures in the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and holds a prominent position in the NATO bloc. This statement by Mr. Strauss is a striking example of the unrestrained propaganda which certain NATO circles are using to further their preparations for precipitating a war.

"Recently, when the Committee of Eighteen has been discussing the draft Declaration against War Propaganda, there have been increasingly frequent statements by revanchists both in Western Germany and in West Berlin, clamouring for the revision of the frontiers in Europe resulting from the Second World War and for the use of force against the German Democratic Republic. These statements can only be regarded as creating an atmosphere of war hysteria in West Germany of which the revanchists and militarists are taking advantage in order to prepare acts of provocation against the socialist States.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

"As a result of the occupation of Thailand by the forces of the United States and of other States participants in the aggressive SEATO bloc which are preparing for military intervention in Laos, the threat of war in South-East Asia has sharply increased during the last few days. Provocative actions in Thailand, Laos and South Vietnam may at any moment lead to a large-scale conflict with all its disastrous consequences for the peoples. One cannot overlook the fact that all these aggressive steps by the United States and its allies were preceded by long preparation of public opinion by the leading statemen and organs of the Press of the United States, both pressing for summary treatment of the national liberation movements of the Laotian people and the people of South Vietnam. This propaganda is still continuing at the present time.

"The Soviet Government could not fail to take account of the fact that, recently, when the question of the prohibition of war propaganda was already under discussion in the Committee of Eighteen, top-ranking United States statesmen have made pronouncements to the effect that, in certain circumstances, the United States Government may take the initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union. Statements of this kind advocating a preventive nuclear war for the purposes of United States policy aggravate international tension and the threat of the outbreak of war.

"The Soviet Government also takes account of the fact that, particularly of late, leading United States statesmen have been extolling nuclear weapons and that numerous books and articles published in the United States urge the need for the early use of such weapons for the solution of outstanding international problems. Universal public indignation was recently produced by the publication in the United States of a book entitled The Legacy of Hiroshima by Mr. E. Teller, which is a solid piece of propaganda for the nuclear arms race and which attempts to justify the unleashing of a nuclear war by the United States for its own political ends. The publication of Mr. Teller's book is a particularly dangerous event because he is playing a key role in the development of new and increasingly destructive types of nuclear weapons in accordance with the instructions of the United States Government.

"In the light of all these facts the Soviet Government has come to the conclusion that, in its present form, the draft Declaration against War Propaganda does not meet the requirements of the situation and calls for considerable improvement. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation, on the instruction

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

of the Soviet Government, submits the following additions and amendments to the text of the draft Declaration for the consideration of the Committee:

a) Insert the following new paragraphs after the second operative paragraph:

'3) Resolutely condemn all appeals for a preventive nuclear war as aggressive acts which conflict with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the interests of maintaining peace, and which are incompatible with the honour and conscience of mankind;

4) Condemn propaganda for revanchism and for the revision of the state frontiers in Europe which resulted from the Second World War as action conflicting with the interests of peace and creating a threat to the security of the peoples;

5) Also condemn as being at variance with the United Nations Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and as threatening universal peace, incitement to the use of force against peoples which have embarked on the course of national liberation and independent development;'

b) Amend the penultimate operative paragraph to read as follows:

'Undertake, within the shortest possible period and in any event not later than six months from the date of signature of this Declaration, to enact legislation, if this has not previously been enacted, declaring war propaganda in any form a grave crime against peace and humanity and providing for severe penalties against persons guilty of conducting such propaganda, including their immediate removal from all official posts, the loss of all ranks and titles and their criminal prosecution.'

c) Redraft the concluding paragraph to read as follows: 'Call upon all other States to accede to this Declaration and to take similar measures in accordance with it.'" (ENDC/C.1/21)

The Soviet delegation proposes that these amendments be discussed, and requests the Secretariat to circulate the text of the statement of the Soviet delegation, together with these amendments, as a document of the Eighteen Nation Committee.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I can only say that, in the light of the very intensive work which my delegation, in co-operation with the Soviet delegation, has done on this declaration against war propaganda, and in the light of the agreement which was worked out and submitted to the Committee of the Whole last week, I have listened this morning with the most profound regret to the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union. It seems to me that

(Mr. Dean, United States)

after we have spent some six weeks in working out this declaration, it is a most astonishing performance -- I repeat: astonishing -- to seize upon the republication of an article written some two years ago by Mr. Strauss.

I had hoped that this declaration against war propaganda would be taken by the world as a symbol of the type of co-operation which could serve as the basis of our work here at this Conference. I had hoped that this could be an example of the way in which we have been working together, trying to reconcile our differences and to agree upon a statement which each of us, and all the other nations which would accede to the declaration, could carry out for the advancement of the peace of the world and for the advancement of the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter.

The statement which the representative of the Soviet Union has made here this morning, if not war propaganda itself, is certainly of a character which might aggravate the international tensions against which the draft declaration before us speaks.

I am sure that both the Soviet Government and the Soviet delegation, which has not spoken to us before this meeting of its profound change in attitude, know full well that they are intentionally blowing up this declaration against war propaganda and that they do not want it -- because further negotiations along those lines are now useless.

There is no sense in spending another six weeks working seven or eight hours a day and then being confronted with this kind of nonsense at the last minute. So the Soviet Government, for purposes of its own, has scuttled this carefully worked out declaration against war propaganda. The members of this Conference can judge for themselves why the Soviet Government has chosen to scuttle this carefully worked out declaration against war propaganda. It is useless to continue further negotiations on such a declaration.

Mr. LALL (India): I would like to raise a point of order. I request that the meeting be suspended for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): The representative of India requests that we suspend the meeting for fifteen minutes. What is the opinion of the Committee?



Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I think that before suspending the meeting, it would be worthwhile ascertaining the views of the different delegations on the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union. In that way, the suspension might be more fruitful.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): We have two proposals before us, one by the representative of India, and the other by the representative of Italy. What is the opinion of the Committee.

Mr. LALL (India): I have no objection. If any delegation wishes to express some immediate reaction, it would do so. But I feel we should suspend fairly soon for fifteen minutes, as I proposed.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): What is the Committee's opinion? I think the best to do is to give the floor to the representative of Mexico, and then suspend for fifteen minutes.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): The comments which the Mexican delegation wished to make have no connexion with the statement made by the Soviet Union representative this morning.

Therefore, bearing in mind the remarks of the Italian representative, I should prefer that the floor be given first to the United Kingdom representative since, as I have said, my remarks would have no bearing on what we have just heard from the Soviet delegation or on the amendments which it has proposed.

My delegation, as no doubt all other delegations have done in respect of their own governments, communicated to the Government of Mexico after the last meeting on this item the text of the Declaration agreed by the co-Chairmen and approved ad referendum by the Committee of the Whole. The object of that communication was to obtain instructions in order to state at this meeting -- as it was hoped would be done by the other members of the Committee in respect of their own governments -- that my government welcomed with satisfaction the Declaration against War Propaganda.

Therefore, what I wanted to indicate was the significance which, in our view, the Declaration has and the beneficial consequences deriving from it, bearing in mind in particular the many efforts of the co-Chairmen and the extremely valuable

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

contribution of other delegations, which resulted in the drafting of the Declaration, as well as its intrinsic value, what the agreement symbolizes and represents and the importance which it may have.

Those were the ideas I wished to set forth today, but in view of the suggestion of the representative of India and the amendments to it proposed by the representative of Italy, I think that the floor should be given first to those who wish to submit their comments on the attitude manifested in the last statement of the Soviet Union representative.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): When I asked for an opportunity to address the Committee this morning I did so in a spirit of hope. I thought it was going to be possible to congratulate our co-Chairmen and ourselves on a definite step forward. It is a pretty bitter moment, I think, for most of us round this table to have to realize that these efforts -- and a great deal of effort had gone into preparing this agreed text, a great deal of effort and discussion round this table and, I would say, a great deal more effort in the behind-the-scenes talks between the co-Chairmen -- are brought to naught. This really is a bitter blow to our Conference, and it is no good trying to disguise that fact. Confidence is not an easy thing to build. I had hoped and thought that we were in fact building it. But if our Soviet colleagues choose to behave in this way, what are we to think?

I had been home to London over the weekend and I had returned with authority to welcome this Declaration. That would have been my purpose and that was what I had proposed to do. I had proposed to welcome the Declaration and to say that this was at least one step forward, perhaps not a very big step but a step forward, on our road. Now, for reasons best known to him, our Soviet colleague has chosen to sabotage the work of our Conference. I cannot escape, on an occasion like this, allowing an element of bitterness to creep into my voice when I see what he has done. Nor can I avoid recalling to my colleagues that this is not the first time the Soviet Union has behaved in this way. I do not want to make capital out of what has gone before, but when one sees these things happening one cannot help remembering that it was the Soviet Union that chose to break up the 1960 Conference; that it is the Soviet Union which, by tearing up the 1958 experts' report (EXP/NUC/28), has made further progress in our nuclear test ban talks so manifestly difficult, in spite of the efforts of so many of our colleagues to help us.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

Why does the Soviet Union do this? I just do not understand. I would have thought that we had an opportunity here to make progress. I see no reason whatever in what has happened over the last few days to justify by one jot or one tittle what they have put before us this morning. Is it in fact that our Soviet colleagues have been told by their government that they must agree to nothing at this Conference? Is that what they have been told? If so, it is a sombre outlook for us all. I hope very much that is not the case.

I am trying to speak in restrained language because I do not wish to make the feeling round this table worse. I want to see us come back to a discussion which will lead us forward, and so I shall curb my tongue although my thoughts may be somewhat bitter. I want to see us return to co-operation. I say quite definitely that there is no justification for this Soviet move. I ask our Soviet colleague to go back to the position which he was willing to adopt as recently as last Friday. I have just been reading in the verbatim record what he said on Friday. It was, in the main, reasonable and conciliatory. I ask him to go back to that position and to agree once again to what he agreed before, and to enable us all to welcome the efforts of our co-Chairmen and to record this element of agreement. Our Soviet colleague knows that it is impossible for some delegations to accept the wording which he has placed before us this morning. He is therefore by this action seeking to preclude agreement. I ask him to take it back. I ask him to allow us to build on the element of agreement which had been achieved. If we do not do this, it will have its effect on our general discussions. Actions such as these cannot be isolated in a body such as this Conference. It is our duty to work speedily for general and complete disarmament. That is what we are here for, and all our action should be devoted to that end. It is in that spirit that I ask our Soviet colleague to reflect on this matter and to get instructions from his government which will allow him to sign that Declaration as it was before, and not to seek to destroy the feeling of amity and goodwill in this Conference in the way that his statement this morning seemed to do. I ask him to retract that statement and to agree to the Declaration as it was formulated. Let him make his statements on other matters, if he wishes; we could do the same about statements which have been made from Soviet sources. But that would not help. Let us still agree to this Declaration so that we do not have in our way this impediment of a breakdown in the very first agreement which seemed to be in sight.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I do earnestly appeal to our Soviet colleague, because I think this morning he has done great harm to our discussions. I shall not say more. There is much more I could say, but I shall not, because I am deeply distressed at the attitude that our Soviet colleague has taken this morning and I do not want any words of mine to exacerbate the feeling here; I want to try and restore our feelings of goodwill and co-operation.

Mr. JAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): My delegation cannot but express the most profound regret at the statement made this morning by the Soviet Union delegation. It told us that it no longer accepted the text which the Committee had adopted unanimously -- I would even say with joy -- a few days ago.

In the context of this complete change of attitude, the Soviet delegation makes fresh accusations, which are completely unfounded, against one of our friends and allies. I have already protested against such accusations which are aimed at disparaging one of our friends, not present at this Conference, with which my country not only participates in a defensive alliance but is carrying out very important collaboration for peace and social progress.

I wonder whether the real reason for the Soviet change of attitude is not to be found in a desire to reject operative paragraph 2 of the agreed Declaration, which stresses that war is unnecessary. It may well be that this statement, which could bring great and immediate alleviation to all peace-loving peoples, is not in accordance with the desire and the will of a communist country which is associated with the Soviet Union and which seems to regard war as an inevitable necessity.

It was therefore with deep regret that the Italian delegation listened this morning to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, which calls in question work which had cost us several months of effort and to the accomplishment of which my delegation had made its contribution by submitting a compromise text.

The Italian delegation, however, hopes that the statement we have heard this morning will not be the Soviet delegation's last word. We hope that that delegation will reflect on the responsibilities that it assumes, with its statement this morning, towards all the peoples of the world who love peace and who are sincerely against all war propaganda.

Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia): May I recall that my delegation, as well as a number of other delegations at this Conference, repeatedly stressed in our discussions on the cessation of war propaganda the necessity of having effective measures for the cessation of war propaganda. We repeatedly drew attention to the fact that we must not limit ourselves to mere words, but must ensure effective, concrete steps which will put an end to the incitement to crime which is constituted by war, and nuclear war in particular. We were and remain convinced that the declaration against war propaganda which we endeavoured in our debates to achieve, together with a number of other delegations, might constitute such an effective step.

However, there is a prerequisite, that it should be sufficiently binding for the policies of those governments which will adopt it. It is different, however, when declarations on general principles are accompanied by facts and acts which testify to the opposite, namely, that the respective governments and their organs intend to continue policies which are in direct contradiction with these principles, even generally worded principles. Such is the case with the present draft declaration against war propaganda and the policy of the Government of the United States and those Governments under its direct influence. After protracted negotiations and repeated objections in this Committee, the delegation of the United States expressed its approval of a draft against war propaganda formulated in very general terms. These general terms -- and vague terms, I would say -- were due mainly to the objections of the United States delegation, which had to be taken into account. At any rate, the declaration could have constituted a vital step forward -- under the assumption, however, that the Government of the United States would in words and deeds distinctly renounce some manifestations of its policy which are expressions of direct war propaganda, in some cases acts of preparation of an aggressive war, or even a step towards open aggression. How else could we qualify the well-known interview of President Kennedy with Stewart Alsop in March of this year when he declared that under certain circumstances the United States "must be prepared to use the nuclear weapon at the start, come what may"? I am quoting from The Saturday Evening Post of 31 March of this year. Such a pronouncement by so distinguished a personality gives direct support to the voices calling for a preventive nuclear war against the socialist countries, for action the criminality of which and at the same time the senselessness of which have been clearly proved time and time again in the past, as well as by many speakers in this Committee.

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

The United States continued to support the effort of West German militarist to arm the forces of the Federal Republic of Germany with nuclear weapons within the framework of NATO. The United States delegation in this Committee, as well as the representative of Italy just now, repeatedly try to make the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany appear to be a pattern of a democratic, peace-loving government, but they cannot conceal the fact that the generals of the Bundeswehr, to whom the United States has, in the military field of NATO, subjected its West European allies, are ex-Nazis, war criminals, who in order to accomplish the objectives which they failed to reach under Hitler, request atomic weapons within the framework of NATO. As reported, for example, by the West German newspaper Die Welt on 23 May, and as was quoted in the statement by our Soviet colleague, the West German Minister of Defence, Mr. Strauss, again called for nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr in an article printed in an official NATO publication. The United States Government uttered no single word against, and took no single step to challenge, those pronouncements and acts of the true representatives of Prussian militarism revived in the Federal Republic of Germany only through the policy of NATO, which in its anti-communism has a common denominator with the policy of Munich in 1938. On the contrary, the United States and its allies fully support, try to justify and even glorify this criminal policy of revanchism and militarism.

These are facts which force the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to raise serious doubts about the effectiveness of a declaration couched in words which are so general and have so little binding effect as those used in the draft before us. On the contrary, face to face with these facts, there stands out a serious danger that such a declaration would serve only to deceive world public opinion, which is cherishing such high hopes from the work of our Committee.

It is no use accusing of sabotage those who are pointing to certain facts which certainly are not in conformity with the principles expressed in the draft declaration. On the contrary, the charge of sabotage applies to those who by those facts and acts are contradicting the principles expressed in the draft declaration.

Under such circumstances the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic must continue to request that the declaration against war propaganda be worded in more binding fashion and in more concrete terms so that it may not serve the Government

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

of the United States and its allies to cover up the flagrant manifestations and acts which cannot be qualified otherwise than as incitement to an aggressive war, the provoking of war hysteria, and even direct preparation and development of war.

That is why the Czechoslovak delegation supports the amendments submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union and proposes that the Committee should deal with them in detail and by their adoption provide a basis for real and effective steps against war propaganda.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

Of course, I would not have asked to speak, especially taking into account the wish of the representative of India to recess the meeting in order, apparently, to exchange views with friends and to think over the situation, but I am obliged to say a few words in order to counter some of the assertions that were made after my statement by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Italy, because I think that before we pass on to further discussion, some clarity must be introduced into the matter.

I must say that the statement made by the representative of the United States, after my statement, is surprisingly tactless. The Soviet Government deems it necessary to improve the draft declaration. It submits specific amendments. The United States representative declares that there is no sense in discussing any amendments that are submitted. Why? What do you dislike in these amendments? Why do you consider it impossible even to discuss these amendments?

The first amendment reads:

"Resolutely condemn all appeals for a preventive nuclear war ..."

(ENDC/C.1/21, page 3).

Are you in favour of these appeals? Why are you opposed even to discussing these amendments?

The second amendment reads:

"Condemn propaganda for revanchism and for the revision of state frontiers in Europe which resulted from the Second World War as action conflicting with the interests of peace and creating a threat to the security of the peoples."

(ibid.)

Are you in favour of revanchism or are you against it? Why are you opposed even to discussing these amendments?

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The third amendment reads:

"Also condemn as being at variance with the United Nations Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and as threatening universal peace, incitement to the use of force against peoples which have embarked on the course of national liberation and independent development."

(ibid.)

Are you in favour of colonial wars or against them? You have always declared that you are an anti-colonial Power. Then why are you against even discussing this question?

I shall not add any further comments. From what I have said already, it is clear that the representative of the United States rejects beforehand any possibility of improving the text of the declaration, although the amendments proposed by the Soviet Government cannot be rejected by those who are really opposed to war propaganda, by those who want to put an end to it not only in words but in deeds. States which really desire the cessation of war propaganda cannot object to the amendments I have just listed.

Nevertheless, the United States representative says straight away that he does not even want to discuss them, that it would be useless to discuss them. This reveals the underlying basis of the whole United States position in the discussion of this question.

You will remember how we discussed this question, what resistance there was precisely on the part of the United States even to a discussion of it, and what statements were made from the very outset to the effect that there was no need for any declaration, etc. True, we went through a good deal of work; for six weeks we carried on a struggle for every word, for every sentence; we achieved the result that the United States apparently adopted the formal position of putting an end to war propaganda. It is now evident that this was by no means a sincere position, because if you are against any further improvement in the declaration, if you reject out of hand any amendments, it does not testify to your sincerity in regard to opposing war propaganda.

On the other hand, it is impossible to ignore real facts. The United Kingdom representative said today that actions, such as actions on the question of forbidding war propaganda cannot be isolated in our work, in the work of the Conference, as he put it. That is true. But they cannot be isolated from what is happening in the



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

world either. Do all of us think when we are sitting here, that we are working here just for ourselves, the seventeen nations that are gathered here, whereas the very opposite to what we are doing may be going on in the world. What sense is there in our work, if we are going to talk about general and complete disarmament, about eliminating war propaganda, whereas in fact wars will be prepared and unleashed? Will anyone believe us then? Will there be any sense in our work? But the real facts show that even at the time when we were discussing this question of prohibiting war propaganda, when we were already reaching agreement on some of the wordings of this declaration, at that very time events were taking place which directly contradicted the position of those who formally spoke in favour of the declaration.

The facts which I have adduced today cannot be refuted. The United States representative spoke about the statement by Mr. Strauss being two years old. No, it is not two years old. It is a statement made on 25 May of this year, that is to say, when we were discussing with you this draft declaration, at that very moment, a member of the government of a country friendly to you -- allied to you, as the representative of Italy put it -- made a statement that was the direct opposite to what we were agreeing upon here with you, and declared that nuclear weapons were necessary not against East Germany but against the Soviet Union. Are we going to play the hypocrite before the whole world? Are we going to put down one thing in writing here and do something different and support one another, as the representative of Italy is now doing -- supporting his presumptuous and aggressive ally? Is this a policy of really lessening international tension? Everyone realizes that this is an insincere policy, that we cannot carry on work in this way -- to agree on something here and then at the same time to act in the opposite manner. That is why the declaration, as the Soviet Government has particularly stressed, will be an effective means of putting an end to propaganda only when it lays down hard and fast obligations of States directed against the forces which are now provoking tension and which are in fact preparing and already conducting wars. Only under these conditions will the declaration play a positive role.

The attitude of certain United States circles towards this declaration is already apparent from what such an influential newspaper as the "New York Times" wrote, only yesterday. It published an article on the declaration we discussed with you on Friday, under the headline: "Declaration Without Value". Why is it without value? This shows the false position which certain circles in the United States

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

are taking on this matter. It is our intention to improve the draft declaration. We have proposed specific amendments and we propose that they be discussed. We are surprised at the attitude displayed by the United States representative, who has rejected out of hand everything that is proposed here.

We have shown the maximum co-operation during the course of our negotiations. Neither you nor anyone else can deny this. We have done our utmost to find some way of reaching agreement, but we see now that our desire to find a way of reaching agreement is being taken advantage of by the circles which are following an entirely opposite line, an entirely opposite policy. Does not what is happening in Germany, Thailand and Laos at this very moment contradict what we are saying here and trying to write down and agree upon?

We cannot have a double system of keeping accounts. It must be one or the other: either you are in favour of really lessening tension, really putting an end to war propaganda in all its forms, including preventive nuclear war, or you are playing the hypocrite in the eyes of the whole world. Therefore, I believe that it is necessary to have a serious discussion of all the concrete proposals which the Soviet Government deemed it necessary to place before the Committee, and I do not think that there is likely to be any support for the attitude expressed today by the United States representative, who rejected out of hand any amendments submitted for the purpose of improving the text of the declaration and making it an effective instrument to tie the hands of those who are preparing and unleashing wars.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I ask for the floor.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): Before I give you the floor, Mr. Dean, I have to consult the Committee in connexion with Mr. Lall's proposal to suspend our work for fifteen minutes.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I would like to reply to the Soviet representative before the recess, if you please, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): I am sorry; Mr. Lall has asked for the floor.

Mr. LALL (India): I would have no objection whatever to listening to the United States representative before I speak.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): I wish to speak after the United States representative. I simply want to say now that the suggestion made by the representative of Italy and approved by the Committee that those representatives wishing to comment on the statement we have heard from the Soviet Union representative should do so before the meeting is suspended. Consequently, any member of the Committee who wishes to express his views in this regard may do so before the recess. I prefer to speak after the representative of the United States has spoken.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I would like to express my appreciation of the courtesy of the representatives of India and Mexico.

I wonder if the Soviet representative has forgotten that it was only three days ago that he and I, as the co-Chairmen, agreed on this declaration against war propaganda. It was only last Thursday that each of our governments stated in the Committee of the Whole that the declaration was satisfactory to us and that we would support it in plenary meeting. I submit to all members of the Conference that it is not a question of the attitude of the United States Government to the so-called amendments which Mr. Zorin has introduced without notice. There was supposed to be a meeting of the co-Chairmen yesterday afternoon, from which Mr. Zorin asked to be excused on the grounds that he was busy: I can now see why he was busy. It seems to me it is a question of the process of a negotiation in a serious conference which, after much effort, much thought, and much goodwill on behalf of all the delegations, produced agreement, an agreement which, when reported in this Chamber, produced no small amount of expressions of satisfaction by all representatives -- I am afraid that these expressions have now turned out to be premature and groundless.

I am sure that the Soviet representative knows full well that Minister Strauss made this statement not on 25 May, but two years ago, and that my Government is in disagreement with the view imputed to Mr. Strauss by the Soviet representative. Why it was republished in a private publication I do not know, but it was not a statement made within the last three days. It has been officially stated on behalf of my Government any number of times, and I repeat it again as representative of the

(Mr. Dean, United States)

United States Government, that it is the official policy of the United States Government that we do not believe in preventive nuclear war or in the first-strike theory. This article by Stewart Alsop which appeared in the March 1961 issue of The Saturday Evening Post has been referred to here several times before. That is not something that happened over the weekend. Mr. Zorin referred to a book by Professor Teller. Professor Teller is a very distinguished physicist, but he does not make public policy for the United States Government and it so happens that his views are not those of the Government of the United States. That book was written some time ago. Why is it that since last Thursday the Soviet Government, after having reached an agreement, has to go back over long periods of time in order to trump up -- I use the word advisedly -- reason for not carrying out its agreement, an agreement reached only three days ago? That is the question before this Conference. It is not, I submit, the attitude of my Government: it is the attitude of the Soviet Government, as to whether it can keep its word over a single weekend. If the Soviet Government cannot keep its word over a single weekend, then I ask members of the Conference just how useful it is to continue the negotiations on this subject.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): I think that all the representatives at this Conference have experienced a feeling of surprise, to say the least. However, I think that, although we hope that surprises of this kind will not occur in the future in the course of our deliberations, we have to get used to the idea that this kind of obstacle may crop up in future and we must nevertheless persevere in our task in spite of temporary disappointments.

I am obliged to make a few remarks. In the first place, within the framework of the draft declaration approved by the Committee of the Whole there is, if the governments supporting it give it a straightforward and sincere interpretation, the possibility of eliminating anything that might amount to propaganda for war and against peace. In my opinion, this is not merely a question of words, of embodying a concrete prohibition in a text; it is a matter of the will, the spirit and the firm desire to interpret honestly the obligations that are assumed.

I remember that when we first began the discussion of this question, the representative of the United States, Mr. Dean, quoted a text from the Gospel which, in his opinion, should guide our deliberations. He said: "Love thy neighbour as thyself". Throughout the history of the world, many such exhortations have been made, not prohibiting hatred but teaching love.

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

I should like to put the following question to the members of this Conference so that they may reflect upon it during the recess: what is the present attitude of the delegations which have consulted their governments, which approved this Declaration in the Committee of the Whole and which have instructions to abide by it? I want to submit for the consideration of my colleagues this other question: is this Declaration still the exclusive property of the two co-Chairmen, or may perhaps other States -- including the eight delegations of the non-aligned countries and those who, if they consider it appropriate, might give their support to the Declaration in the General Assembly of the United Nations -- have acquired certain rights? I ask: Can the matter be ended in this way?

With all due respect, I should like to recall the statements on this matter made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States of America on 25 May, statements which I transmitted to my government. Mr. Zorin said:

"We consider the document as an independent one adopted by the States participating in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. This does not mean, however, that such a document cannot play its role at the General Assembly. Such a document can be submitted to the General Assembly for endorsements. (ENDC/C.1/PV.8, page 12)

The United States representative then expressed his complete agreement with the remarks made by the Soviet Union representative.

Moreover, we are accustomed to adopting resolutions in the General Assembly; we know, for example, the whole process of the signing of a treaty, its subsequent ratification, the reservations that on ratification may be made by States with regard to the text itself, and we also know that despite those reservations it may be signed and ratified by those countries that wish to commit themselves to certain principles which they regard as appropriate and necessary for the international situation at a given moment.

For all these reasons before the suspension of the meeting I should like my colleagues to consider this aspect of the Declaration and the extremely categorical statement made by Mr. Zorin and afterwards confirmed by the representative of the United States of America. That was why I asked my first question whether the document could be regarded as the exclusive property of the two co-Chairmen, or

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

whether on the other hand it could be taken that, in view of the foregoing circumstances and of the symbolic nature of the text which had been completed after considerable efforts, the States have acquired certain rights over the document. I wonder, too, whether the approval of the document and the consultations that we have had with our governments have not already taken on an irreversible character.

Those are the remarks I wanted to make so that my colleagues could reflect on them.

Mr. TARADANOV (Bulgaria) (translation from French): We have just heard a statement by the Mexican representative who, in explaining the possibility of certain governments appropriating the declaration -- a separate question which could certainly be discussed later on -- said that in regard to every document there was always the possibility of doing something for its implementation, no matter how the document was drafted. Yes, we agree that there is such a possibility and I am the first to recognize it. But for that possibility to be really utilized by a government, the latter must have the intention to do so. The government must have the intention to avail itself of the possibility offered by this declaration against war propaganda and to do what is necessary in order to stop war propaganda. But what do we find here? If we consider the whole course of the discussion and also all the statements made during the discussions that we have had both here and outside, we see that on the part of the Government of the United States and certain other governments there is no intention of taking this declaration into account. That is the important thing, and it is that which makes us think of the possibility, or the impossibility, of really achieving in these conditions the cessation of war propaganda.

During the recent discussion that we have had here, the United States repeatedly stated that the taking of legislative and administrative measures against war propaganda was contrary to the United States Constitution and to the traditions of freedom and expression of opinion of that country.

If there are any who doubt this, I will give some examples. In his statement of 27 April the United States representative, referring to the declaration, said:

"As for the substance of what we were to try to agree upon, Mr. Lorin has continued to insist on the inclusion in any agreed text of condemnation of war propaganda of provisions for prohibitory legislation with respect to it."

(ENDC/C.I/PV.5 page 18)

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

He went on:

"... So we cannot be a party in good faith to a declaration or other action which on its face purports to commit us to a course of action which we know in advance to be unconstitutional or otherwise unfeasible so that later on, having agreed to it, we would have to say that we could not carry it out because it was unconstitutional or not feasible." (ibid. pages 18-19)

Immediately afterwards, if you remember, Mr. Dean compared war propaganda with questions of freedom of religion and the free flow of ideas and so forth.

We wonder why the United States insisted on this wording of the present paragraph 5: "... including measures in a legislative form in the case of States which consider such form appropriate ..." (ENDC/C.I/18 page 2). So the States which do not consider it appropriate would not take legislative measures.

What happened immediately afterwards? During the whole period of the negotiations here, statements and incitements to war have been multiplied. Action has even been taken. For example, during this period it has been continually asserted that the order to land United States troops in Thailand was a necessary policy. What for? In order to continue the repression of peoples who are endeavouring to shake off the yoke of colonialism, who are striving to free themselves from certain puppet governments set up there by imperialist circles.

Perhaps you doubt whether this action of the United States was undertaken deliberately in order to increase the tension in South East Asia. Well then, a French newspaper, independent of the government and which cannot be accused of sympathy for communism, such as Le Monde, writes in this connexion:

"There is one striking feature in all these 'crises' in Laos: the disproportion between cause and effect, between, on the one hand, the trivial vicissitudes of this little guerilla war in which usually there are only clashes here and there between small groups of partisans of half a dozen men each and hardly more numerous regular 'detachments'; and, on the other hand, the astonishing repercussions of these vicissitudes and 'battles' on the international stage, the diplomatic complications and tensions which ensue.

"Because a Laotian village near to Thailand is occupied by the Pathet-Lao, President Kennedy calls his advisers together, staffs are warned, the Seventh Fleet sails for Siam and at the same time there are considerable diplomatic repercussions throughout the world. And all to find out finally that the

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

village in question, although it may have been evacuated by the government garrison, has not even been occupied by the Pathet-Lao forces."

(Le Monde, 27-28 May 1962)

This is how in certain circles, at the very time when we were discussing this draft declaration, crises have been created in order to justify intervention. Is this the way in which we desire the draft declaration to be carried out? Is this the way in which we should carry out the draft declaration, threatening countries and whole regions with force in order to intervene and try to set up a regime to our liking or to safeguard a puppet government? This is how the United States -- and I regret to have to say -- its allies who went to its aid, have acted in order to increase international tension at the very time when we were discussing this draft Declaration.

Another point I should like to take up -- and which has been contradicted by the representative of Italy -- is the intensive preparation for the supply of nuclear weapons to the German militarists. There have been vigorous protests here, but one might think that Western Germany is not only not absent but is present, so to speak, in several persons. It has stout defenders of its policy of aggression and preparation for war.

With regard to this preparation which is being carried out at the very moment when we are engaged in discussion, the information newspaper La Tribune des Nations of 25 May (that is to say, at the very moment when we were taking the decisions to submit to our governments the declaration which we had had so much trouble in drafting) wrote, after the visit to the United States of the official in charge of nuclear affairs of Western Germany, Dr. Siegfried Balke:

"... And the Americans have agreed to sell to the Germans -- more easily than to the French -- certain nuclear equipment, an operation intended, as is known, to improve the United States balance of payments, which is not very favourable as regards Western Germany.

"A secret agreement has also been concluded for the training in the United States of German specialists in atomic matters, for the delivery to Bonn of technical equipment and production equipment for atomic plants and of materials for the utilization of several technological processes.

"The specialists -- and this is the most important -- go so far as to claim that, with some 'improvements' which the Germans are providing, this basis provided by America could be easily reconverted so as to start producing atomic weapons in the Federal Republic."



(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

There you have the war propaganda and preparations for war that were going on while we were discussing this question of the prohibition of war propaganda. Not only among certain of our colleagues was there no intention of prohibiting war propaganda, but they were participating in preparations for war together with those who twice already have been directly responsible for the outbreak of two world wars.

In these conditions, one wonders whether this preparation for war, the statements that have been mentioned, the interviews given by responsible German Ministers and, in particular, the declaration of the West German Minister of Defence published in the NATO "General Military Review" while we were discussing the declaration against war propaganda, were not meant to give us an example of the atmosphere in which this Declaration would be carried out. Our delegation considers that that was precisely the atmosphere that it was desired to create during the discussion of the draft declaration against war propaganda in order to show all those circles which are particularly interested in the production of armaments that there would be no cessation of war propaganda. Indeed if, at the very time when a decision was being taken to end war propaganda, the most prominent leaders of the Western countries could make such preparations for war, there is no doubt that the commentary of the New York Times to the effect that the declaration against war propaganda was of no value is really an assessment which corresponds with the real intentions of the American circles interested in the continuation of war propaganda.

We consider therefore that if we wish to adopt a declaration against war propaganda, it is advisable, and even absolutely necessary, to introduce amendments into the text of the declaration in order to give it a more mandatory character for States so that we can really rely on such a declaration. That is why we fully support the amendments submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union and we should like the Committee to discuss them.

A short time ago we heard a statement made by the representative of the United States who said that it was useless to discuss further the draft declaration against war propaganda or the amendments proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union. We think that this statement of the United States representative only shows that, if there is no desire to improve the text of the declaration drafted and approved by the Plenary Committee, it is because there is no real desire to prevent war propaganda. We consider that a statement such as that made this morning by the United States representative is not calculated to advance our work. On the contrary,

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

we should do our utmost to improve the draft declaration against war propaganda.

Moreover, we consider that the statements which have been made by certain other Powers expressing their disappointment have no direct connexion with the actions they have undertaken. I have said, and I repeat, that we regretted that certain Western Powers should have joined the United States in going to Laos and sending their troops there in order to settle a crisis which was deliberately and artificially created. That is why we think that those Powers should also be so obliging as to work on a declaration against war propaganda, which would be of a more mandatory nature, which would contribute to a greater extent to the success of our work and, above all, which could give relief to mankind by showing it that the threat to use force or to resort to force for the settlement of international disputes will not be used in the future.

Mrs. MYRDAL (Sweden): I shall refrain from making any lengthy statement now. We certainly need the proposed recess, and we can only hope that it will succeed in bringing us out of the impasse in which the Conference now finds itself.

I have asked for the floor only to make two very brief statements, which are rather in the nature of announcements. First, I wish to state that the Swedish Government has given its delegation here full authority to accept, on its behalf, the draft declaration against war propaganda as that declaration stands. Secondly, I wish to register the full and complete agreement of my delegation with all the statements which the representative of Mexico made in his recent speech.

Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (translation from French): The Polish delegation participated in the preparation of the draft declaration against war propaganda, being moved by the conviction that the draft should meet certain essential requirements, without which its value would be illusory. We considered that the draft should contain a clear and precise condemnation of the war propaganda carried on by certain circles which are interested in the maintenance and increase of tension, and that it should also stipulate specific undertakings which would put an end to such activities. That was the purpose of our amendments.

It is also obvious that a document such as the draft declaration against war propaganda cannot be examined in the abstract, independently of the international situation. That is why, although we were interested in the efforts of the Committee

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

to reach agreement in this field -- and we continue to be so -- we consider that the reasons set forth today by the Soviet delegation are valid and sound. These reasons tell strongly in favour of a revision of the provisional text that was agreed, in order to give it the necessary precision.

For these reasons, we support the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union. In particular, we share the concern expressed by Mr. Zorin regarding the danger represented by the development of the expansionist, militarist and revanchists aspirations of the Federal Republic of Germany. As is known, we have repeatedly expressed this concern. The obstructive attitude of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany with regard to the necessity of settling the problem of Germany and West Berlin, the obstinate "No" with which any chance of relaxing tension is opposed by Mr. Adenauer, who at the same time demands nuclear weapons and, at least, joint decisions in regard to their utilization, the warlike statements of the Minister of Defence Strauss, who promises a speedy doubling of the military potential of the Federal Republic of Germany, all this constitutes, in the light of the revanchiste policy of this State in regard to Poland and other countries, not only active war propaganda, but an open aspiration to unleash war.

The representative of the United States, Mr. Dean, said that Mr. Strauss's statement quoted by the Soviet Union representative was made two years ago. I should like to assure Mr. Dean that statements by this member of the Federal Republic of Germany -- statements marked by an aggressive spirit -- are being continually made, and always for the same purpose, namely to obtain for the Bundeswehr weapons of mass destruction in order to support with this trump card the policy of Mr. Adenauer, which is opposed to the relaxation of tension.

The statement of the Soviet delegation also mentions other activities which cannot but cause anxiety to all peace-loving people.

I should like to point out that Poland is following with anxiety the development of events in and around Laos. We participated in the Geneva Conference on Laos and we were members of the International Commission on Laos, being moved by the desire to help the Laotian people in their peaceful development in independence and neutrality. The intervention of the United States forces in Thailand and the virtual occupation of that country can only increase tension in the region of South-East Asia and support the reactionary puppets of Vientiane in their military provocations.

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

These are the reasons for our support of the Soviet Union proposals the aim of which is that the Committee should adopt a document which would have a real and positive influence on the evolution of the international situation. I must say that if the United States delegation were definitely to take the attitude of refusing to discuss the proposed amendments, it would indeed be a bad omen; it would show the negative attitude of the United States with regard to effective measures against war propaganda.

By adopting the Soviet Union proposals, our Committee would be able to help towards muzzling the forces of aggression, which recently have become increasingly active, and towards lessening tension. In that way our work on general and complete disarmament would be facilitated.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

Mr. LALL (India): After consultation with many representatives, including the two co-Chairmen, I should like to make a proposal. But I understand that the names of the representatives of Canada and Romania are on the list of speakers. Therefore, I shall wait until those two representatives have spoken before making this proposal.

Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation came to this meeting this morning hoping to congratulate the co-Chairmen on the agreement which they had reached on the declaration, and with instructions from the Canadian Government to support and subscribe to this declaration, worked out after so much persistent and careful negotiation which we thought had been crowned with success. I must say we were dismayed at the statement of the Soviet representative conveying the instructions of his government, which amounted in effect to re-opening the whole negotiation.

We have to say that we are quite unable to understand from the reasons cited by the Soviet representative why it has apparently been necessary for the Government of his country to change its mind about the declaration in the short time that has elapsed since agreement on it was announced in the Committee of the Whole. We feel that the declaration, while it may not have been satisfactory to everybody, at least represented an agreement in this Conference and a step forward in the direction which we had all been hoping to take, that is, the direction of lessening tensions and promoting further fruitful work in our discussions on general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

We regard this as a setback. We hope that it may prove to be a temporary one. We hope that it may yet be possible to put forward the declaration which was subscribed to by all of us on 25 May, so that it may fulfil its purpose of discouraging any publications, from whatever side or from wherever they may come, from pretending that war is inevitable, giving encouragement to the use of force, or doing anything contrary to the engagements which we have all taken in subscribing to the United Nations Charter.

That is what I wish to say at this juncture. We are unhappy about what has taken place but we hope that this is not going to be more than a temporary setback in the work of this Conference.

I thank the representative of India for delaying the submission of his proposal until my delegation had had an opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): Thank you, Mr. Lall, for yielding the floor to the representative of Canada and myself.

I should like to say a few words in my capacity as representative of Romania. I do not want to lengthen the discussion at this stage of our work. However, I wish to associate myself with the statements made by the delegations of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Poland, aimed at an improvement of the draft declaration. The additions proposed by the Soviet Union are fully justified by recent events, which indicate precisely the point where the greatest care has to be taken by us. The incitements to and appeals for preventive nuclear war which have accompanied the most recent military acts of the United States show that in order to be effective the draft declaration has to include the prohibition of such appeals, and not leave them outside its scope. At the same time the declarations of revanchism and militarism in West Germany remind us that any action toward peace must include the condemnation and banishment of such dangerous phenomena.

The Romanian delegation considers that if work is to be durable it has to be taken seriously by the countries participating in it. My Government is of the opinion that the declaration must represent a very serious and solemn obligation and that we have to put this idea into the text of the declaration. Signatory States have to show, through the very language of the document, their desire to respect it and to apply it in letter and spirit.

Mr. LALL (India): Today many governments sent their representatives here with instructions to approve the draft declaration which was already before us. But there have been swift developments and a new situation has been created. This situation will require a great deal of thought and much wisdom in order to resolve it in a way which will permit this Conference to continue its constructive endeavours toward achieving its goal of general and complete disarmament under effective control.

Therefore, taking into account the goal which we must achieve and the new situation, I now formally propose, after consultation with the co-Chairmen and other delegations, that we adjourn discussion of this particular subject immediately until an agreed date, this date to be decided upon by the co-Chairmen and proposed later to the Committee. We should now adjourn discussion of this matter and meet again, probably tomorrow morning as it is now rather late, to go on with our work on general and complete disarmament: that is my proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): Are there any comments on the proposal by the representative of India that there should be an adjournment of this debate? If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): Therefore, we shall have a meeting tomorrow to discuss the treaty on general and complete disarmament. As to the draft declaration against war propaganda, the two co-Chairmen will consult as to the procedure to adopt for further consideration of it.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I agree with the proposal which has just been made. Only one thing worries me and it is the same as that which I expressed here on Friday. On Friday, speaking as Chairman, I asked for authority to inform the Press that an agreement had been reached concerning war propaganda, and I wonder what we can now tell the Press about the present situation.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): I should like to inform you that there was a text which had been seen by the two co-Chairmen, but since there has been no agreement we propose that in today's communique there be no mention of this debate.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

I think it would be better simply to read out the text of the communique. As I understand it, the communique will say that statements were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and so forth. So your remark about not mentioning the discussion sounds rather unintelligible, and I think the fact that there was a discussion will be indicated by the list of speakers. As for the Press, everyone will of course say what he considers necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): I will read out the draft communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its forty-fourth plenary meeting at the Palais des Nations in Geneva under the chairmanship of Mr. Macovescu, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of Romania.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, India, Italy, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Sweden, Poland, Canada and Romania.

"In accordance with the agreement on procedural arrangements adopted by the Conference on 14 March 1962 (ENDC/1, paragraphs 3 and 4), all documents and final verbatim records of the Conference distributed as of 15 May will be made available to all Members of the United Nations and for public use on 4 June 1962 through the United Nations Secretariat at Geneva and New York.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Wednesday, 30 May 1962, at 10 a.m."

Mr. GODBEE (United Kingdom): I do not wish to prolong the discussion but I do see a difficulty following on the comment raised by the representative of Italy in regard to the communique. I have just referred to the communique for last Friday, and it contains the following:

"The Conference has received from the Committee of the Whole a declaration against war propaganda, which has been adopted unanimously by the Committee of the Whole. Definitive action will be taken by the Conference on Tuesday, 29 May 1962, after consultation with Governments." (ENDC/PV.42, p. 21)

(Mr. Gower, United Kingdom)

It will be observed that the communique states that "definitive action will be taken" today. Therefore, whether we can completely ignore this question in our communique today is, I think, something we must consider: possibly we ought to refer to this declaration and say that it was discussed and further action was postponed. If we just ignore the question, it may lead to complications and difficulties in view of the very definite statement in Friday's communique.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

What has just been said by the representative of the United Kingdom is perhaps deserving of attention. As a matter of fact, in the course of our preliminary discussions we had the intention to indicate in the communique that a statement was introduced by the Soviet delegation, and we might add that a final decision on the declaration against war propaganda was postponed. Perhaps that is how we could put it in the communique?

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): It seems to me that if there is to be a reference in the communique to a statement by the representative of the Soviet Union, then that reference should be followed by a comment that he introduced this new statement despite the fact that the declaration against war propaganda had been unanimously approved by the Committee of the Whole last Thursday. If there is any mention of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, then I shall insist that there be a mention of the unanimous approval by the Committee of the Whole of the declaration against war propaganda. If there is no mention of it, then I shall not insist upon that addition.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

Perhaps we can still find what is known as a compromise solution. We could refer to the previous communique and say that in connexion with the decision adopted at the last meeting a statement of the Soviet delegation was introduced as a document -- I said today that we were introducing the statement as a document, and we have agreed to mention any documents in the communique. We could say that a statement of the Soviet delegation was introduced as a document in connexion with the previous communique, of such and such a date, and that the final decision on the declaration against war propaganda was postponed. I think this should satisfy everybody, because in the



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

previous communique we explained what it was all about. If everything is to be repeated in the new communique, we shall have to explain all the motives. I do not think this is possible now. Perhaps we could agree on this with a reference to the previous communique.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): At the meeting of the Committee of the Whole on 25 May the representative of the Soviet Union said:

"As for the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United States, these two Governments, if I understand the situation correctly, have already approved this proposal. Therefore, in our case, there is no need for further instructions." (ENDC/C.I/PV.8, page 31)\*

I said:

"I agree entirely with the remarks just made by the representative of the Soviet Union." (ibid., page 32)\*

It seems to me that if there is going to be any mention in the communique of further amendments to the declaration against war propaganda, then we should add "despite the unanimous approval of the declaration in the Committee of the Whole on 25 May".

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

I can see that Mr. Dean is rather cross, and wants insistently to indicate what should be said by way of addition to explain the situation. If we follow such a path we shall obviously never agree on any communique, because each of us will insist on his own point of view.

I must point out that Mr. Dean himself, in his statement at our previous meeting on 25 May, said:

"... we could, assuming that we were all in agreement, proceed to adopt it on a 'no objection' basis ..." (ENDC/C.I/PV.8, page 7)

However, very weighty considerations arose for the Government of the Soviet Union -- considerations which have been set forth today. Therefore in accordance with your own position, we must discuss this question anew, because new and very weighty considerations of the Government of the Soviet Union have appeared. Therefore it is not enough to try and explain it all by referring to our previous statement. I think that if we want to achieve unanimity we could limit ourselves to a reference to the last communique. If we cannot achieve this unanimity -- if the United States

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

delegation thinks it necessary to explain something further in the new communique, then it will be necessary to say nothing. There is no other way out. We are not deciding this question by a vote; we have to reach agreement.

We are proposing a solution which, in our opinion, should be acceptable to all, namely to refer to the previous communique and say that, in connexion with the statement introduced by the Soviet delegation, the question of the final approval of the declaration has been postponed. If you do not wish this and will not agree to it, let us not mention anything. Let us leave the communique in its original form, and then the wishes of the United Kingdom representative will not be fulfilled.

Mr. GODBEE (United Kingdom): I am not quite sure in what spirit that last sentence was uttered by the representative of the Soviet Union. I am certainly not seeking to make difficulties in regard to this question; I merely want to get it clarified for the record. I would not have referred to it but for the very specific reference in Friday's communique. In trying to get over this, I was trying to concoct a form of words myself. I do not say this is a perfect form of words, but it seemed to me that, either before or after giving the list of speakers, one could say that consideration had been given to the declaration against war propaganda, which was referred to in the communique for 25 May, that the Soviet Union had introduced a formal statement and that, following upon further discussion, this matter had been deferred. Some such form of words might meet the case.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I am sorry, but I do not think I can agree to any mention of the statement of the Soviet Union unless it is also stated that the declaration against war propaganda was unanimously approved in the Committee of the Whole on 25 May.

I would not object to the communique in its original form.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): Although we have agreed in principle that the verbatim records are to be made public only after fifteen days, I wonder whether we could not adopt the communique as proposed by the Soviet delegation and, at the same time, publish immediately the record of the meeting of 25 May. I think that the Committee has reserved the right, in special cases, to publish the verbatim records immediately.

Mr. LALL (India): I would like to propose that we accept the communique as it was read out by the Chairman. That would be the most acceptable way of dealing with this matter. With great respect to the representative of the United Kingdom, I would say that the record is clear. Anyone who does get the record when it is published will know exactly what has happened and why the matter has been postponed. The mere fact that there is no mention in today's communique of definitive action on the question of war propaganda will in itself, by implication, make it sufficiently clear that we have not taken a decision on that question. I would therefore suggest that we adopt the communique as the Chairman read it out.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): If that is the wish of my colleagues, I am perfectly willing to go along with it. I merely wanted us to be logical. I always thought that my colleague from India was a very logical man. But I am perfectly prepared, if it is the general desire, in order to get over the difficulty, that it should be as he suggests. I merely thought it was important to call attention to the illogicality, when compared with what happened before.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I merely wish to add that I was in favour of the logic of our document and therefore accepted the proposal of the United Kingdom representative. But since not everyone was in favour of the logic of this document, we had to give it up. And of course, I shall not insist on this logical document.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania): If I hear no further comments, I shall take it that it would be acceptable to all representatives to leave the communique in its original form.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

